

equipment for all? Why determine the extent of education in anatomy for a graduate of a medical school and fail to determine the same thing in the case of an osteopath who claims to have an equal and similar fundamental education? Let us read what *The Osteopath*, a journal of that sect published in Los Angeles, has to say on the subject in its issue for November-December, 1906:

"The applicant for a State certificate of qualifications to practice medicine in the State of California must take an examination in the following subjects: Anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, pathology, chemistry and toxicology, surgery, obstetrics, materia medica and therapeutics, theory and practice of medicine. The applicant for a certificate of qualification to practice osteopathy should properly be examined in all of the foregoing subjects except materia medica and theory and practice of medicine; in lieu of these, he should be examined in gynecology, physical diagnosis, and principles and practice of osteopathy. The present medical board is composed of regulars, homeopaths and eclectics. The applicant for a State certificate is examined by the mixed board on all subjects except materia medica and principles and practice of medicine. On these subjects he is examined by the representative of his particular system. In other words, in the branches of science common to all, one examination is conducted; in the special materia medica and theory and practice of it, the regular is examined by regulars, the homeopath by homeopaths and the eclectic by eclectics."

Now, let us consider the claims put forth by the osteopathic colleges as to the fundamental instruction given. Fortunately, the *Texas State Journal of Medicine* has compiled a list of the text books recommended by a number of schools, including regular, homeopath, eclectic and the American School of Osteopathy at Kirksville, Mo. In the list of text books recommended by the last mentioned institution, we find a total of 118 titles; of these 112 are written by members of the regular profession, and but six are by osteopathic authors. In the subject of "Practice," we find 38 titles listed, and of these but 4 authors are of the osteopathic school. Of the 34 books on practice written by regulars, we find such names of authors as Anders, Osler, Tyson, Eichhorst, Stelwagon, Hyde, Pusey, Dana, Barker, Fox, etc. Would it not appear from the text books used and the instruction alleged to be given, that the practice of osteopathy comes mighty near the practice of medicine? Then why have a separate and distinct board to license osteopaths? Why permit one board to license persons, without any demonstration of their fitness, to practice medicine under the name of osteopathy? Is the State safeguarding its people properly and fully if it says that any one to practice medicine as such must demonstrate his fitness, but that he may practice

medicine, under the cloak of osteopathy, without inquiring into his qualifications to do so? As we have already seen, in the paragraphs quoted from *The Osteopath*, even the members of that cult raise the question themselves. Granted that the given individual has had sufficient education in the fundamental branches of medical science (as taught in all medical schools, and which the osteopaths say they teach in their colleges), to pass an examination at the hands of a composite board, do you think he can do much harm, whether he gives big pills, or little pills, or no pills, or massages the spine? He certainly must have enough knowledge of anatomy and physiology and pathology to keep him from going farther astray than the average educated physician, and that is all that the State does or should require, and all that the courts hold should be demanded of him who treats the sick. Then, why not concentrate the police work of the State, so far as it deals with healing the sick, in the hands of one board? Do away with the examination in materia medica and therapeutics and principles and practice of medicine, and simply require every applicant of whatever school or pathy to take the same examination which the disciple of any other school is required to take. Is this not a rational and practical solution of the problem?

The State journal that does not give its active as well as its passive support to the work of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association, is by implication making its State medical organization a traitor to the American Medical Association and a deserter from the camp of its friends. It was the House of Delegates of the A. M. A. that established and made permanent the Council. It was done with the overwhelming approval of the delegates representing the State organizations, and those organizations must either support the work or repudiate it. For two consecutive years they have supported it in the House of Delegates of the A. M. A., and now they must either support it in their own home States or stand charged with hypocrisy and double dealing. If a publication, owned and controlled by a medical society which has gone on record as supporting the Council, persists in advertising the rank and worthless frauds which have been exposed by the Council, how can we reproach the published-for-profit journals, or even the *Medical Record* or the *New York Medical Journal*, for doing the same thing? And the work of the Council is all for the purpose of securing just one little thing—nothing more or less than simple truth and honesty on the part of the manufacturer who presents his wares for our consumption. Is that too much to ask? Just simple truth? Is there a medical society in the United States that would have the nerve to go on record as opposing the fight for truth and honesty? And yet a number of the organs of State medical organizations are tacitly opposing this work and this struggle for truth, by ignoring it. Last month the JOURNAL had a few words of criticism in regard to the policy

of the *New York State Journal of Medicine* and the manner in which its advertising pages tended to defeat the work of the Council and of the association. There are other State journals just as bad, or worse, and from time to time we may be tempted to have a heart-to-heart talk with the gentlemen who control them. Just at this time, however, we wish to call your attention to the list of remedies already approved by the Council, which you will find in the advertising pages. Take this page out and put it on your desk, where you can consult it, and try and see whether you can not successfully practice medicine with the remedies of the pharmacopeia and those new and nonofficial ones which have been approved by the Council. If a detail man comes to see you, look through the list and see whether his valuable preparation (they are all always "valuable preparations"!) has been approved by the Council. If it has not, tell him what you think about it—and him—and the "house."

The Legislature is, as you are doubtless painfully aware, now in session. There will be numerous bills affecting public health matters introduced; indeed, **PUBLIC HEALTH LEGISLATION.** quite a goodly number have been introduced at the time of writing. Some of these are good and should receive our support; some are bad and vicious and should be rejected. There will also be a number of bills relating to medical license and to the licensing of osteopaths, naturopaths, neuropaths, etc. All of these bills will be very carefully studied by our attorneys and by our Legislative Committee, and the secretary of the State Society will keep the component societies in touch with what is going on. Our profession has always occupied a too retiring attitude in regard to these matters of public health. We have a very considerable potential influence and it is high time we woke up and used it for the protection of the public in matters in which we have knowledge and they are ignorant. What layman, for instance, would realize the true nature of a bill like the naturopathy bill, which would license any form of quackery known? The bill reads most learnedly and is quite as high-sounding as though it were the real thing. Our legislators are busy men; they have not time to study each and every proposed law that comes before their attention, least of all many of these public health measures, the real importance of which is often not on the surface nor in the title. It is our plain, simple duty to advise them of what these things mean. It is the duty of each county society to take up these questions energetically and to instruct the legislators from its section as to the right and the wrong of bills of this class. No one of us can do much alone; nor can we do much unless we work together, at times each giving way somewhat to the views of the great majority. Elsewhere in this issue, we print a list of the members of both houses of the Legislature. This is printed not merely to fill space, but for your own reference. When the time comes that you are asked by the

society to support or oppose some measure, refer to the list and write, if possible, to every member of the Legislature; certainly to your own representatives. And do not stop there. Go to your friends and patients amongst the influential laymen. Explain to them what the import of the proposed law really is and how it affects the general public and how your medical society stands in regard to it, and ask their help. It is astonishing how much the opinions of influential constituents affect the attitude of legislators! We shall count on your help and we feel more than confident that we shall not count in vain.

The condition of things in the matter of the minimum fee for life insurance examinations is becoming very interesting. As you will **INSURANCE SITUATION.** doubtless recall, your JOURNAL was the first to take up the matter actively and oppose the cut from \$5.00 to \$3.00. Slowly the movement has grown until it is being very actively prosecuted in many States. We note with pleasure that the State journals of Texas, New Jersey, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and some others, have taken vigorous stand and are encouraging their members to fight for a decent fee. In our own State, more than half of the county societies have gone on record as absolutely opposing the cut, and in many of these counties the three-dollar companies can do little if any business. The other day we learned that the New York Life was so hard put to it in Santa Cruz county that they had offered several men a salary of \$25.00 a month in addition to the fees, if they would accept the \$3.00 fee on small policies. If we are correctly informed, and we believe we are, no one has yet been secured in that county who will do the dirty cut-rate work. Three other companies have issued instructions to their California departments to pay the \$5.00 fee whenever it is demanded. Just remember that and always demand the \$5.00 fee; if the company happens to be one of these three, you will get it; if it is not, do not make the examination. This is one of the fights we are bound to win if we simply stick to it and to each other. Do not be discouraged; things are coming our way pretty fast and eventually we will win out.

Under this caption, the *Texas Courier-Record of Medicine* for December, 1906, prints an editorial that is somewhat interesting. It seems **"IS IT RIGHT?"** that all papers read before the Texas State Medical Association and the various district societies which are affiliated with it, are sent to the *Texas State Journal of Medicine*, the official journal of the association, and that the "independent medical journals" can not secure them for publication. The *Courier-Record* asks, plaintively, "is this right?" Let us see what sort of an "independent" medical journal the *Courier-Record* really is. The page measures 4¼x8 inches, and according to the pagination of the December number, it contains 34 pages of text; of